Dear Kari P.,

2/4/87

You need make no apologies for your English. I did not notice any errors except for a simple transposition in spelling a single word. And having read you letter, I'll respond to your questions in the order of their appearance.

A rather large percentage of the many people who have written me were about your age when JFK was killed and all remember clearly where they were when they heard that bad news.

By the way, surface mail cannot be insured. And you can do the calculations when you get the packages, of which this is the first.

The man who claimed to be the dead Oswald's lawyer and who actually represented Mrs. Oswald senior is Mark Lane. He is an exceptionally able man who is also exceptionally amoral. He is a plagiarist and is dishonest in many other ways. I owe you candor.

While on the subject of critics, I can't speak to highly of Meagher's and Roffman's books. All the others are flawed in various ways. Kurtz is a strange one - he puts down all those from whom he steals and there is nothing original in his book other than his errors. Summers twists things to reach a preconceived conclusion that is based on nothing and has no basis in real fact. Or reason or logis. I've not read his book on Marilyn Monroe and will not because I know his method and because I'm not interested in being titillated. This and the element of scandal involving a celebrity, I believe, account for the interest in that book in Sweden and elsewhere. The Weberman book also is fiction. I believe I addressed the Veciana business when we spoke. Nothing to it. Thompson's book is a conjecture based almost entirely on the work of others, some credited and some cribbed. He had a different conspiracy solution in an article in the old Saturday Evening Post. Wecht has not wrotten any books. His testimony before the House committee was quite eloquent and solid. If Kurtz says that my work is conjectural you'll be able to see for yourself that it is the opposite. ...People like Kurtz, Lifton and Thompson have a problem-by the time they write all they have to say has been published, so they evolve means of getting around that, at least to their own satisfaction and often to that of the usually uninformed critics....I see Kurtz said "speculation." You'll see for yourself.

Kurtz may have had his own reasons for the formulation you quote but he cannot honestly say that the "evidence" shows that Oswald had no intelligence connection first because the Commission never sought any such evidence and second because Kurtz also didn't and is ignorant. The crime was never investigated, nor was the possibility that Oseald had an intelligence connection. I believe he did, on the basis of my own analysis to begin with and later on the basis of records the Commission avoided that I did get and for now am not using publicly. I have given permission to another.

On publishers not answering mail: if they have nothing to sell they are ill-mannered enough not to invest the cost of responding when the books are out of print. Just yesterday my wife wrote to one of the larger chains of bookstores asking them as she has many time to pay for the books they bought for eleven of their branches and never paid for. I was sorely disappointed to learn how extensive dishonesty is in the book business....I see you refer to Scott. He is quite bright, imaginative, and he confabulates, as I learned when I asked him to comfirm something he had written. I have not read what you refer to. He was one of three who compiled an anythology that also is not worth getting because it is not faithful to the writing of those it uses . ...My apologies for my typing. I must sit with my legs elevated and type sideways.... I'm not surprised that Woodward hasn't answered you from what you say. He is embarrassed and probably is busy and considers himself rather important now. At the same time, please remember that he may get too much mail to be able to answer all of it.

I fear that what you say of German intelligence is typical of all of them. Our CIA, for example, did not learn from the many crimes of its anti-Castro Cubans and

has been and is making the same tragic error with the fascistic Samoza Nicaraguans. Where will they go and what will they do when Honduras, as ultimately it must, tries to kick them out? And if it fails, what will they do in and to Honduras?

I don't know the original of the description "black bag" jobs but I believe it was the FBI here and many years ago. Those burglaries were more often not in embassies and they got that name because they used black bags to carry what they stole.

What your intelligence people did other agencies, including our own, also did to elected officials and their families. They all suffer the same paranoia...It would not be easy for most people to believe what the FBI's own records disclose it did to me, for example, and I am far from unique in this regard.

I've read of Peter Wright's problems with Maggie Thatcher and the opposition to her in Australia. He can solve that problem easily by publication in the U.S.if he does not prevail in Australia. I'd like to read his book.

I agree with you that in a genuine democracy nobody is exempt from the law but here those who are responsible for enforcing the law, like the Department of Justice and its FBI, are wholesale violaters of the law, from my personal experience in my Freedom of Information Act litigation. And the courts, almost without exception, seem to fear them. In any event, they have to now been immune. I have them charged with perjury and fraud in one case and they've not even denied it.They feel they do not have to and thus far they have been correct in this. The judges all know what they have done by way of character assassination. Court records are immune from suit and my case is irrefutably documented but no paper gives a damn and I've sent copies to quite a few. So the official criminals have this added immunity. Often I wonder if democracy can survive this.

We spoke of Penn Jones and I've never read Nash's gush of goo about him. Won't.

Seth Kantor's work is dubious in that he exaggerates the meaning of the incidents on which he builds his case. Ruby was never more than a punk and nobody would ever have trusted him in any kind of conscious conspiracy. I do believe, however, that Kantor did see Ruby at the hospital. He knew Ruby well.

What you quote of Scheim's book is one of the reasons I've never read it. Bud Fensterwald was born rich, is bright, conjectures conspiracies with which I do not agree, I've never joined any of his organizations, but what Scheim says is garbage. I know Bud very well. He merely follows the lawyer's obligation to represent those who need a lawyer.

We discussed Garrison and Ponzi. The House committee followed my last book and they avoided it and me. Lane did not defend Ray, he ruined him, and it was before the House of Representatives, this committee. Lane will do anything for attention and that mess got it for him, coast to coast.

Thank you for your personal comments about me. When you've read my work you will see that I've actually made a study of how our institutions work or fail to work, and I do not speculate about the crime. I regard it as no more than a writer's obligation in a democratic society and as a personal obligation, more so because I am the first member of my family going back to the pre-Christian era who was born to freedom. My people fled to pogroms in Russia.

I will not always be able to answer long letters because if I follow my doctors' orders just taking care of myself requires more than five hours a day. I'm not supposed to sit still for more than about 20 minutes at a time, so long phone conversations also are not good for me. But I appreciate the genuiness of your interest and I think that I've answered all your questions. I'll follow your desires on mailings.

Best wishes, Harold Weisberg

Harold